

Supreme Court Decision Ends Sit-Down Strikes in America

Labor Board Decision Condemned; the Employees of Fansteel Corporation "Had the Right to Strike, But They Had No License to Commit Acts of Violence or to Seize Their Employers Plant," Decision Says; Order Requiring Fansteel to Re-employ Strikers Held Illegal

Although hailed by Communists, anarchists, parlor intellectuals, pseudo liberals and political opportunists as an advanced technique for the workers in labor disputes, the sit-down strike was definitely killed and appropriately buried by the United States Supreme Court in its decision in the case of the National Labor Relations Board vs. the Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation.

Two of the main points vigorously defended by the Labor Relations Board, and emphatically outlawed by the Supreme Court, hinged on the legal validity of the sit-down strike of the Fansteel Corporation, employees

endorsed by the C. O. Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, and the right of the corporation to discharge employees who participated in such practices. With regard to the sit-down strike the Supreme Court majority opinion, Justice Brandeis, said:

"The employees had the right to strike but they had no license to commit acts of violence or to seize their employer's plant."

"We may put on one side the contentions of the corporation and the related questions as to the circumstances and extent of injury to the plant and the contents in the efforts of the men to obtain recognition of 'the right to strike' plainly contemplates a lawful strike."

The seizure and looting of the buildings was itself a wrong apart from any other wrong that it is in its legal aspect the ousting of the owner from his possession is not essentially different from an assault upon the officers of an enterprise. The seizure and the conversion of its goods, or the despoiling of its property or other unlawful acts, in order to force compliance with demands.

To justify such conduct because of the existence of a labor dispute or of unfair labor practice would be to substitute legal remedies and to subvert the principles of law and order which are at the foundations of society."

Pointing out that the "true purpose" of Congress in enacting the National Labor Relations Act was to protect the right of employees to organize and to the selection to represent the employees for the purpose of the operation of Section 2 (3) without construing it as countenancing lawless conduct, the court intended to support employees in action by making it impossible for the employer to terminate the relation upon that independent ground.

When the strike was illegal in its inception and prosecution, as the board found, it was initiated by the decision of the union committee to take over

Government Loan

...and held two of the respondent's key buildings." It was pursuant to that decision that the union took the buildings and the work stopped.

Seizure Right Denied

"This was not the exercise of the 'right to strike' to which the act referred. It was not a mere quitting of work and statement of grievances in the exercise of procedures of the contract. It was an illegal seizure of the buildings in order to prevent their use

NLRB Ruled Contrary to Evidence In Sands Case, Supreme Court Says

Supreme Court Appeals Court Decision in Outlawing Board's Order.

By J. A. L. Weekly News Service

Washington, D. C. The decision of the Supreme Court overruling the action of the National Labor Relations Board charging the Sands Manufacturing Co. with unfair labor practices in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, was handed down today by the Court.

The Court's decision is a landmark in the history of labor law, as it is the first time the Court has ruled in favor of the right of self-organization, affiliation with labor organizations and collective bargaining by employees. The Court's decision is a landmark in the history of labor law, as it is the first time the Court has ruled in favor of the right of self-organization, affiliation with labor organizations and collective bargaining by employees.

The Court's decision is a landmark in the history of labor law, as it is the first time the Court has ruled in favor of the right of self-organization, affiliation with labor organizations and collective bargaining by employees.

On the various points at issue in the Justice Roberts, who wrote the three-to-five decision said, "The company refused to bargain collectively with the representatives of its employees as required by Section 8 (b) of the Act; the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) urges the correctness of the ultimate conclusion that the representative of the company is not a reasonable inference that the employees were locked out, discharged, and refused employment because they were engaged in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining. We think the conclusion has no support in the evidence and is contradicted by the uncontradicted evidence of record."

Chief Justice Hughes and Justice Mc-

Supreme Court Voids Labor Board's Ruling in Columbian Enameling Case

Washington, D. C.—The decision of the United States Supreme Court rejecting a ruling of the National Labor Relations Board that the Columbian

Shandling and Stamping Company, Inc., of Terre Haute, Indiana, had declined to bargain collectively with a union, the striking members of which the board demanded should be reinstated because of this alleged failure, challenged the basis presented by the

**L. O. Governing Body Transacts
Important Business for the Workers**

[illegible]

Supreme Court Decision Ends Sit-Down Strikes in America

(Continued from Page 1)

by the employer in a lawful manner and thus, by acts of force and violence, to compel the employer to submit.

"When the employees resorted to that argument that the Pansteel Corporation did not have the legal right under the labor act to discharge employees because of sit-down strike activities, the Court

"We think that the argument misconstrues the statute. We are unable to conclude that Congress intended to compel employers to employ their employees regardless of their unlawful conduct—to invest those who go on strike with an immunity from discharge for acts of trespass or violence against the property of the employer. We would not have enjoyed had they remained at work."

Falls to Find Law Support

"As respondent's unfair labor practices afforded no excuse for the seizure and holding of its buildings, respondent had its normal rights of redress. Those rights, in their most obvious scope, in-

Justice McReynolds, Butler, Stone and Brandeis affirmed this position taken by President William Green of the A. F. of L. in March 1931, that the sit-down strike is "illegal, outrageous, and utterly opposed to American institutions and abhorrent to the economic and organization policy of the American Federation of Labor."

found in the terms of the National Labor Relations Act." Hughes in the majority opinion, Justices Black and Reed dissented.

EDITORIALS

(Continued from Page 1)

cluded the opinion with this significant declaration regarding the responsibility of stockholders for the debt incurred by the bank:

"Concluding as we do that this stockholders' liability was a right which attached when Central gave its note to the plaintiff and is enforceable in a

The distressing note in the case is that the wealthy stockholders involved in this malodorous transaction should be so lacking in business morality as to attempt to defraud the Government and violate the law prescribing their legal obligation.

Democracy and the Unemployed Army

This fear that democracy is seriously menaced by the persistent refusal of employers to provide jobs for millions of unemployed workers was well expressed by Secretary of Commerce Harry L. Hopkins in his recent address before the Economic Club of Des Moines, Iowa, in the following terse statement:

"Some people may think we can maintain a democracy in this country indefinitely with 10,000,000 unemployed. I don't. If I had no other motivation other than my deep love of freedom, I would want to do every thing in my power to try to help solve the problem of unemployment."

As a definite step toward providing employment for the jobless Mr. Hopkins urged teamwork between the Government, private industry and labor in the development of reasonable programs to expand production on a profit-

making basis. But he did not mention shorter hours which the continued introduction of labor-displacing, job-destroying machinery has made imperative but which organized capitalists, determined to seize the achievements of technological improvements for the exclusive benefit of profit grabbers, still intransigently refuse to accept as a fundamental part of our industrial policy.

basis of the solution of the unemployment problem. It is to be hoped that serious minded officials in both the Government and private industry will quit stargazing in considering unemployment, examine the question with a pragmatic realization of the facts, and join with labor to rescue the victims of job-destroying machinery by applying shorter hours of work.

Government Is Victorious in First Suit For Violating Wage-Hour Act

**Concern's Employees Contained
As Little As \$2.38 and \$2.64
Per Week; Fined \$1,500.**

By A. F. of L. Weekly News Service.
Boston, Mass.—The efficacy of the

imposed would "show it had cost more than \$2,000 to play with fire," which would be "sufficient to discourage others."

Mr. Brill presented evidence that only young woman employs received only \$2.54 for one week's work and another only \$2.35. He estimated the company's 1936 gross profit at \$1,000 by crediting

The act also secured the disposition of fines totaling \$14,900 following pleas of guilty entered by the defendants.

The guilty pleas were entered in behalf of Brown Contract Stitching, Inc., a Lawrence (Mass.) Shoe Company, and Nathan Brown, its treasurer and general manager, to four Federal indictments charging failure to pay a

the Wage-Hour Act. The company employs about 300 persons.

Another Lawrence shoe company is under Federal investigation. Federal officers indicated other manufacturers in this region would come under their scrutiny.

"The Government wants manufactur-

minimum wage costs cents an hour, falsification of records, failure to keep required records and the placing in interstate commerce of goods produced under those conditions.

Federal Judge Elisha H. Brewster imposed a \$1,000 fine on Brown and a \$500 fine on the company on each indictment.

I. L. O. Governing Body Transacts Important Business for the Workers

(Continued from Page 1)

The Governing Body after long discussion accepted the reports of several committees with the following recommendations:

1. C.A.A. Committee on Recreation: A ground work in coal mines for singing and dancing.

2. " (3) Weekly rest in commerce and industry for double discussion.

3. " (4) Rights of Performers in Broad

(1) Consultation with the request of the workers group a much broader scope will be considered by this committee.

(2) Study of discrimination against the elderly worker: at the request of the workers group this study is to be continued by a consultation of the governments.

(3) Committee on Safety on coalmines. This study relates to a discussion which it was decided to place on the agenda for the 1946 Conference.

(4) The Governing Body received the reports of experts in the investment; of Social Insurance Funds and the Report of the Mixed Agricultural Committee.

(5) The Preparatory Textile Committee made a report on the setting up of an International Tripartite Committee on the Textile Industry. The Governing Body authorized the setting up of such a committee, and approved its terms of reference as defined by the Preparatory Committee.

"The agenda for the 1930 Conference of the International Labor Organization was agreed to be as follows:

- (1) Labor Inspection for single discussion.
- (2) Safety provisions for under-

account of the date of Easter fixed the date of the Eighty-Seventh Session of the Governing Body to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, during the week of April 17 to April 27, 1929."

"The agenda for the 1930 Conference of the International Labor Organization was agreed to be as follows:

- (1) Labor Inspection for single discussion.
- (2) Safety provisions for under-

account of the date of Easter fixed the date of the Eighty-Seventh Session of the Governing Body to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, during the week of April 17 to April 27, 1929."